arXiv:0804.3461v1 [quant-ph] 22 Apr 2008

Permutation-invariant monotones for multipartite entanglement characterization

Xi-Jun Ren,[*] Wei Jiang, Xingxiang Zhou,[†] Zheng-Wei Zhou,[‡] and Guang-Can Guo
Key Laboratory of Quantum Information,
University of Science and Technology of China,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China

Abstract

In this work we consider the permutational properties of multipartite entanglement monotones. Based on the fact that genuine multipartite entanglement is a property of the entire multi-qubit system, we argue that ideal definitions for its characterizing quantities must be permutation-invariant. Using this criterion, we examine the three 4-qubit entanglement monotones introduced by Osterloh and Siewert [Phys. Rev. A. **72**, 012337]. By expressing them in terms of quantities whose permutational properties can be easily derived, we find that one of these monotones is not permutation-invariant. We propose a permutation-invariant entanglement monotone to replace it, and show that our new monotone properly measures the genuine 4-qubit entanglement in 4-qubit cluster-class states. Our results provide some useful insights in understanding multipartite entanglement.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud,03.67.Mn

---

[*] Electronic address: renxijun@mail.ustc.edu.cn
[†] Electronic address: xizhou@yahoo.com
[‡] Electronic address: zwzhou@ustc.edu.cn

Quantification of quantum entanglement is one of the most important problems in quantum information theory [1]. For pure states of bipartite systems, a good entanglement measure is entropy of entanglement [2]. It measures the entanglement content in a pure bipartite state which can be asymptotically concentrated into the standard form of Bell states, using local operations and classical communications (LOCC). For pure states of multi-qubit systems, the problem of defining good entanglement measures becomes complicated because the qubits in a generic multi-qubit state can be entangled in different ways under asymptotic LOCC [3].

Following recent studies on the structures of genuine multipartite entanglement [4, 5, 6], researchers have proposed many quantitative measures for different classes of multipartite entanglement [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. A particular interesting proposal is Osterloh and Siewert [12, 13]'s N-qubit entanglement monotones (for an N-qubit system) constructed with antilinear operators. They have the appealing property of yielding zero for all possible product states, and are therefore considered good measures for genuine N-qubit entanglement [13, 14].

Despite the recent progress in the study of multipartite entanglement, the important issue of permutational properties of its quantitative measures has not received sufficient attention. For an N-qubit system, genuine N-qubit entanglement is an overal property of the entire system and should not rely on the labeling of the qubits. In other words, proper definitions for quantities characterizing genuine multipartite entanglement should be permutation-invariant. This is a natural requirement and is obviously satisfied by the bipartite entropy of entanglement. However, the permutational properties of most existing definitions of multipartite entanglement measures are rather hard to investigate because of their mathematical complexity. As an attempt to study the permutational properties of multipartite entanglement measures, we analyze Osterloh and Siewert's 4-qubit entanglement monotones [12, 13] and show that one of them is not permutation-invariant. In place of it, we propose a monotone which does preserve its value under qubit permutation. We show that our monotone properly describes the genuine 4-qubit entanglement in 4-qubit cluster-class states and thus is a good alternative to the non-permutation-invariant quantity in Osterloh and Siewert's monotones.

We start by briefly introducing Osterloh and Siewert's 4-qubit entanglement monotones for a generic 4-qubit state

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i,j,k,l=0}^{1} A_{ijkl} \, |i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle \otimes |k\rangle \otimes |l\rangle \, . \tag{1}$$

The three entanglement monotones, named filters in [12], are constructed with antilinear operators as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = (\sigma_\mu \sigma_\nu \sigma_y \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma^\mu \sigma_y \sigma_\lambda \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma_y \sigma^\nu \sigma^\lambda \sigma_y), \tag{2}$$

$$\mathcal{F}_2 = (\sigma_\mu \sigma_\nu \sigma_y \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma^\mu \sigma_y \sigma_\lambda \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma_y \sigma^\nu \sigma_\tau \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma_y \sigma_y \sigma^\lambda \sigma^\tau), \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_3 \;=\; & \frac{1}{2}(\sigma_\mu \sigma_\nu \sigma_y \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma^\mu \sigma^\nu \sigma_y \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma_\rho \sigma_y \sigma_\tau \sigma_y) \\ & \bullet (\sigma^\rho \sigma_y \sigma^\tau \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma_y \sigma_\lambda \sigma_\xi \sigma_y) \bullet (\sigma_y \sigma^\lambda \sigma^\xi \sigma_y), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where the same index is contracted with the metric $g^{\mu,\nu} = diag\{-1, 1, 0, 1\}$. Using these operators, we can obtain three SLOCC invariants and entanglement monotones [3, 15]: $|\mathcal{F}_i| = |\langle\langle \mathcal{F}_i \rangle\rangle_C|$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Here, a complex conjugation is carried out before the expectation is taken. By virtue of the special contraction rules, these monotones have zero values for all possible product states and therefore characterize genuine 4-qubit entanglement.

As shown in [12], $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s can be used to classify different 4-qubit entangled states. Whether they qualify as proper genuine 4-qubit entanglement measures is an open question, however their permutational properties provide an important criterion in resolving this matter. Unfortunately, it is difficult to see $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s permutational properties directly from their antilinear operator definitions given above. To attack this problem, we adopt an indirect strategy by expressing $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s in terms of a set of $SL^4(2)$ algebraic invariants introduced by Luque and Thibon [16] whose permutational properties can be easily deduced.

Considering the fact that many SLOCC invariants can be constructed with the antisymmetric tensor ϵ [17], we first write $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s using ϵ and A_{ijkl}, the coefficients of a generic 4-qubit pure state in Eq. (1). This can be done by expressing σ's, the so-called "combs" in the definitions of $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s, in terms of ϵ. The first comb operator, σ_y, can be directly replaced with antisymmetric tensor ϵ because of the relation $\sigma_y = -i\epsilon$. The second comb operator, $\sigma_\mu \bullet \sigma^\mu$, where the upper and lower indexes are contracted with the metric $g^{\mu,\nu} = diag\{-1, 1, 0, 1\}$, can also be expressed with ϵ. For example, if $\{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$ is contracted under the rules of $\sigma_\mu \bullet \sigma^\mu$, then we have $(\sigma_\mu)_{i_1 i_2} g_{\mu\nu} (\sigma_\nu)_{i_3 i_4}$ and with direct calculations we can check that this is equal to $\epsilon_{i_1 i_3}\epsilon_{i_4 i_2} + \epsilon_{i_1 i_4}\epsilon_{i_3 i_2}$. Using these relations, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{F}_1| &= |4A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4}A_{i_5j_5k_5l_5}A_{i_6j_6k_6l_6} \\
&\quad \times(\epsilon_{i_1i_3}\epsilon_{i_2i_4}+\epsilon_{i_1i_4}\epsilon_{i_2i_3})\epsilon_{i_5i_6}\epsilon_{j_1j_5}\epsilon_{j_3j_4}\epsilon_{j_2j_6}\epsilon_{k_1k_2}\epsilon_{k_3k_5}\epsilon_{k_4k_6}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}\epsilon_{l_3l_4}\epsilon_{l_5l_6}|, \qquad (5) \\
|\mathcal{F}_2| &= |8A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4}A_{i_5j_5k_5l_5}A_{i_6j_6k_6l_6}A_{i_7j_7k_7l_7}A_{i_8j_8k_8l_8} \\
&\quad \times(\epsilon_{i_1i_3}\epsilon_{i_2i_4}+\epsilon_{i_1i_4}\epsilon_{i_2i_3})\epsilon_{i_5i_6}\epsilon_{i_7i_8}\epsilon_{j_1j_5}\epsilon_{j_3j_4}\epsilon_{j_2j_6}\epsilon_{j_7j_8}\epsilon_{k_1k_2}\epsilon_{k_3k_7}\epsilon_{k_5k_6}\epsilon_{k_4k_8}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}\epsilon_{l_3l_4}\epsilon_{l_5l_7}\epsilon_{l_6l_8}|, \qquad (6) \\
|\mathcal{F}_3| &= |4A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4}(\epsilon_{i_1i_3}\epsilon_{i_2i_4}+\epsilon_{i_1i_4}\epsilon_{i_2i_3})\epsilon_{j_1j_3}\epsilon_{j_2j_4}\epsilon_{k_1k_2}\epsilon_{k_3k_4}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}\epsilon_{l_3l_4} \\
&\quad \times A_{i_5j_5k_5l_5}A_{i_6j_6k_6l_6}A_{i_7j_7k_7l_7}A_{i_8j_8k_8l_8}(\epsilon_{i_5i_7}\epsilon_{i_6i_8}+\epsilon_{i_5i_8}\epsilon_{i_6i_7})\epsilon_{j_5j_6}\epsilon_{j_7j_8}\epsilon_{k_5k_7}\epsilon_{k_6k_8}\epsilon_{l_5l_6}\epsilon_{l_7l_8} \\
&\quad \times A_{i_9j_9k_9l_9}A_{i_{10}j_{10}k_{10}l_{10}}A_{i_{11}j_{11}k_{11}l_{11}}A_{i_{12}j_{12}k_{12}l_{12}}\epsilon_{i_9i_{10}}\epsilon_{i_{11}i_{12}}(\epsilon_{j_9j_{11}}\epsilon_{j_{10}j_{12}}+\epsilon_{j_9j_{12}}\epsilon_{j_{10}j_{11}})\epsilon_{k_5k_7}\epsilon_{k_6k_8} \\
&\quad \times\epsilon_{l_9l_{10}}\epsilon_{l_{11}l_{12}}|. \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

In [16], Luque and Thibon introduced a complete and independent set of four $SL^4(2)$ algebraic invariants, $\{H, L, M, D_{xt}\}$, for a 4-qubit system. The permutational properties of these invariants are simple and will be derived later. Our aim is to write $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s with this set of invariants, by comparing their antisymmetric tensor expressions. H, a degree-2 invariant whose each term involves only two coefficients, can be directly written as

$$H = \frac{1}{2}A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}\epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{j_1j_2}\epsilon_{k_1k_2}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}. \qquad (8)$$

The three degree-4 invariants L, M, N are given by the determinants of three matrices:

$$L = \begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_4 & a_8 & a_{12} \\ a_1 & a_5 & a_9 & a_{13} \\ a_2 & a_6 & a_{10} & a_{14} \\ a_3 & a_7 & a_{11} & a_{15} \end{vmatrix}, M = \begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_8 & a_2 & a_{10} \\ a_1 & a_9 & a_3 & a_{11} \\ a_4 & a_{12} & a_6 & a_{14} \\ a_5 & a_{13} & a_7 & a_{15} \end{vmatrix}, N = \begin{vmatrix} a_0 & a_1 & a_8 & a_9 \\ a_2 & a_3 & a_{10} & a_{11} \\ a_4 & a_5 & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_6 & a_7 & a_{14} & a_{15} \end{vmatrix}, \qquad (9)$$

where $a_r = A_{ijkl}, r = 8i+4j+2k+l$, is another notation of state coefficients. L, M, N have the relation $L+M+N = 0$, thus only two of them are linearly independent. It should be noted that H^2 cannot be expressed as a linear combination of $\{L, M, N\}$, thus H is independent of them. D_{xt}, the last in the set $\{H, L, M, D_{xt}\}$, is of degree 6. All together, there are 6 degree-6 invariants $D_{xt}, D_{xy}, D_{xz}, D_{yz}, D_{yt}, D_{zt}$. These six invariants are constructed with methods of classical invariants theory. They satisfy $D_{xt} = D_{yz}, D_{xy} = D_{zt}, D_{xz} = D_{yt}$ [16] and can be expressed as the determinants of three 3×3 matrices:

$$D_{xt} = \begin{vmatrix} a_0a_6 - a_2a_4, & a_0a_7 + a_1a_6 - a_2a_5 - a_3a_4, & a_1a_7 - a_3a_5, \\ a_0a_{14} + a_8a_6 & a_0a_{15} + a_6a_9 + a_1a_{14} + a_7a_8 & a_1a_{15} + a_7a_9 \\ -a_2a_{12} - a_4a_{10}, & -a_2a_{13} - a_4a_{11} - a_3a_{12} - a_5a_{10}, & -a_3a_{13} - a_5a_{11}, \\ a_8a_{14} - a_{10}a_{12}, & a_8a_{15} + a_9a_{14} - a_{10}a_{13} - a_{11}a_{12}, & a_9a_{15} - a_{11}a_{13}. \end{vmatrix},$$

$$D_{xy} = \begin{vmatrix} a_0a_3 - a_1a_2, & a_0a_7 + a_3a_4 - a_2a_5 - a_1a_6, & a_4a_7 - a_5a_6, \\ a_0a_{11} + a_3a_8 & a_0a_{15} + a_3a_{12} + a_4a_{11} + a_7a_8 & a_4a_{15} + a_7a_{12} \\ -a_2a_9 - a_1a_{10}, & -a_2a_{13} - a_1a_{14} - a_6a_9 - a_5a_{10}, & -a_6a_{13} - a_5a_{14}, \\ a_8a_{11} - a_9a_{10}, & a_8a_{15} + a_{11}a_{12} - a_{10}a_{13} - a_9a_{14}, & a_{12}a_{15} - a_{13}a_{14}. \end{vmatrix},$$

$$D_{xz} = \begin{vmatrix} a_0a_5 - a_1a_4, & a_0a_7 + a_2a_5 - a_1a_6 - a_3a_4, & a_2a_7 - a_3a_6, \\ a_0a_{13} + a_5a_8 & a_0a_{15} + a_5a_{10} + a_2a_{13} + a_7a_8 & a_2a_{15} + a_7a_{10} \\ -a_1a_{12} - a_4a_9, & -a_1a_{14} - a_4a_{11} - a_3a_{12} - a_6a_9, & -a_3a_{14} - a_6a_{11}, \\ a_8a_{13} - a_9a_{12}, & a_8a_{15} + a_{10}a_{13} - a_9a_{14} - a_{11}a_{12}, & a_{10}a_{15} - a_{11}a_{14}. \end{vmatrix}.$$

D_{xt}, D_{xy} and D_{xz} are linearly independent. They have the following relations with $\{H, L, M, N\}$ [16]: $HL = D_{xz} - D_{xt}$, $HM = D_{xt} - D_{xy}$, $HN = D_{xy} - D_{xz}$. Therefore only one of $\{D_{xt}, D_{xy}, D_{xz}\}$ can be selected to form a complete set of invariant generators together with lower-degree invariants H, L, M. Because of the matrix-determinant representation of these invariants, we can easily deduce their permutational properties. For instance, if we take the expression for L in Eq. (9) and permute the first and third qubit, the elements in its matrix transforms as follows: $a_2 \leftrightarrow a_8, a_3 \leftrightarrow a_9, a_6 \leftrightarrow a_{12}, a_7 \leftrightarrow a_{13}$ and all other elements do not change. We see immediately that this gives us $-N$ since the new matrix obtained after these transformations is just the matrix of N with transposition and exchange of two columns. The permutational properties of other three 6-degree invariants can be obtained similarly. H is obviously invariant under qubit permutaitons as can be seen directly from Eq. (8). These results are summaried in Table I.

All these invariants, $\{L, M, N, D_{xt}, D_{xy}, D_{xz}\}$ can be also expressed using anti-symmetric tensors. By directly expanding the determinant expressions of $\{L, M, N\}$ and observing their terms, we obtain the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} 4(N - M) \; = \; & A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4} \\ & \times \epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{i_3i_4}\epsilon_{j_1j_2}\epsilon_{j_3j_4}\epsilon_{k_1k_3}\epsilon_{k_2k_4}\epsilon_{l_1l_4}\epsilon_{l_2l_3}, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

qubit permutation	H	L	M	N	D$_{xt}$	D$_{xy}$	D$_{xz}$
$1 \leftrightarrow 2$	H	-L	-N	-M	D$_{xz}$	D$_{xy}$	D$_{xt}$
$3 \leftrightarrow 4$							
$1 \leftrightarrow 3$	H	-N	-M	-L	D$_{xy}$	D$_{xt}$	D$_{xz}$
$2 \leftrightarrow 4$							
$1 \leftrightarrow 4$	H	-M	-L	-N	D$_{xt}$	D$_{xz}$	D$_{xy}$
$2 \leftrightarrow 3$							

TABLE I: Transformations of invariants under qubit permutations.

$$\begin{aligned} 4(M-L) &= A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4} \\ &\quad \times \epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{i_3i_4}\epsilon_{j_1j_3}\epsilon_{j_2j_4}\epsilon_{k_1k_4}\epsilon_{k_2k_3}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}\epsilon_{l_3l_4}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned} 4(L-N) &= A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4} \\ &\quad \times \epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{i_3i_4}\epsilon_{j_1j_4}\epsilon_{j_2j_3}\epsilon_{k_1k_2}\epsilon_{k_3k_4}\epsilon_{l_1l_3}\epsilon_{l_2l_4}. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

By simple algebraic manipulations, we can express L, M and N in terms of the antisymmetric tensor ϵ,

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \frac{1}{12}A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4} \\ &\quad \times \epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{i_3i_4}\big(\epsilon_{j_1j_4}\epsilon_{j_2j_3}\epsilon_{k_1k_2}\epsilon_{k_3k_4}\epsilon_{l_1l_3}\epsilon_{l_2l_4} \\ &\quad -\epsilon_{j_1j_3}\epsilon_{j_2j_4}\epsilon_{k_1k_4}\epsilon_{k_2k_3}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}\epsilon_{l_3l_4}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \frac{1}{12}A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4} \\ &\quad \times \epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{i_3i_4}\big(\epsilon_{j_1j_3}\epsilon_{j_2j_4}\epsilon_{k_1k_4}\epsilon_{k_2k_3}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}\epsilon_{l_3l_4} \\ &\quad -\epsilon_{j_1j_2}\epsilon_{j_3j_4}\epsilon_{k_1k_3}\epsilon_{k_2k_4}\epsilon_{l_1l_4}\epsilon_{l_2l_3}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

$$\begin{aligned} N &= \frac{1}{12}A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4} \\ &\quad \times \epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{i_3i_4}\big(\epsilon_{j_1j_2}\epsilon_{j_3j_4}\epsilon_{k_1k_3}\epsilon_{k_2k_4}\epsilon_{l_1l_4}\epsilon_{l_2l_3} \\ &\quad -\epsilon_{j_1j_4}\epsilon_{j_2j_3}\epsilon_{k_1k_2}\epsilon_{k_3k_4}\epsilon_{l_1l_3}\epsilon_{l_2l_4}\big). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

With the aid of a computer programme, we expand the complicated determinant expressions for the degree-6 invariants and find that $D_{xz} + D_{xt} + D_{xy}$ can be simply expressed with the antisymmetric tensors as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} 4(D_{xz}+D_{xt}+D_{xy}) &= A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4}A_{i_5j_5k_5l_5}A_{i_6j_6k_6l_6} \\ &\quad \times\epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{i_3i_4}\epsilon_{i_5i_6}\epsilon_{j_1j_3}\epsilon_{j_2j_4}\epsilon_{j_5j_6}\epsilon_{k_1k_5}\epsilon_{k_2k_6}\epsilon_{k_3k_4}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}\epsilon_{l_3l_5}\epsilon_{l_4l_6}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

With the relations between H, L, M, N and D_{xt}, D_{xy},D_{xz}, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} H(M-L) &= 2D_{xt}-D_{xy}-D_{xz} \\ &= 3D_{xt}-(D_{xz}+D_{xt}+D_{xy}). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

The antisymmetric tensor expression of D_{xt} is:

$$\begin{aligned} D_{xt} &= \frac{1}{3}[(D_{xz}+D_{xt}+D_{xy})+H(M-L)] \\ &= \frac{1}{12}A_{i_1j_1k_1l_1}A_{i_2j_2k_2l_2}A_{i_3j_3k_3l_3}A_{i_4j_4k_4l_4}A_{i_5j_5k_5l_5}A_{i_6j_6k_6l_6} \\ &\quad \times[\epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{i_3i_4}\epsilon_{i_5i_6}\epsilon_{j_1j_3}\epsilon_{j_2j_4}\epsilon_{j_5j_6}\epsilon_{k_1k_5}\epsilon_{k_2k_6}\epsilon_{k_3k_4}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}\epsilon_{l_3l_5}\epsilon_{l_4l_6} \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{i_1i_2}\epsilon_{i_3i_4}\epsilon_{i_5i_6}\epsilon_{j_1j_2}\epsilon_{j_3j_5}\epsilon_{j_4j_6}\epsilon_{k_1k_2}\epsilon_{k_3k_6}\epsilon_{k_4k_5}\epsilon_{l_1l_2}\epsilon_{l_3l_4}\epsilon_{l_5l_6}]. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The antisymmetric tensor expressions of D_{xy} and D_{xz} can be similarly obtained.

Now that we have antisymmetric tensor expressions for both $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s and $\{H, L, M, D_{xt}\}$, we can find the relations between them. By making many trials using a computer program, we get

$$|\mathcal{F}_1| = 8[4(D_{xz}+D_{xt}+D_{xy})-H^3], \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}_2| &= 16[H^4-4H(2D_{xt}+D_{xz}+D_{xy})-16LM] \\ &= 16[H^4-4H(D_{xt}+D_{xz}+D_{xy})-4(HD_{xt}+4LM)], \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}_3| &= 32[4(N-M)+H^2]\times[4(L-N)+H^2]\times[4(M-L)+H^2] \\ &= 32\{H^6+16H^2[-(M^2+N^2+L^2) \\ &\quad +(MN+NL+ML)]+64(N-M)(L-N)(M-L)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

These nontrivial identities are the key results that allow us to analyze the permutational properties of $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s. From Table I, we see that $H, D_{xt}+D_{xz}+D_{xy}, M^2+N^2+L^2, (N-M)(L-N)(M-L)$ and $(MN+NL+ML)$ are all invariant under permutations of the four qubits. Therefore, $|\mathcal{F}_1|$ and $|\mathcal{F}_3|$ are both invariant under qubit permutations. However, $|\mathcal{F}_2|$ is not invariant under qubit permutations because $(HD_{xt} + 4LM)$ in $|\mathcal{F}_2|$ is not. This implies that $|\mathcal{F}_2|$ cannot be considered a good candidate for genuine 4-qubit entanglement measures.

To address this difficulty, we propose a new permutation-invariant monotone by using the following method. Starting with the expression for $|\mathcal{F}_2|$ and making permutations between qubits, we can construct two other monotones according to Table I:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}_4| &= 16[H^4 - 4H(D_{xt} + 2D_{xz} + D_{xy}) - 16LN] \\ &= 16[H^4 - 4H(D_{xt} + D_{xz} + D_{xy}) - 4(HD_{xz} + 4LN)], \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{F}_5| &= 16[H^4 - 4H(D_{xt} + D_{xz} + 2D_{xy}) - 16MN] \\ &= 16[H^4 - 4H(D_{xt} + D_{xz} + D_{xy}) - 4(HD_{xy} + 4MN)]. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Since the three monotones $|\mathcal{F}_2|, |\mathcal{F}_4|, |\mathcal{F}_5|$ are obtained by qubit permutations, their sum $|\mathcal{F}_2'|$ is then obviously permutation-invariant:

$$|\mathcal{F}_2'| = 16[3H^4 - 16H(D_{xt} + D_{xz} + D_{xy}) - 16(MN + NL + ML)]. \tag{24}$$

$|\mathcal{F}_2'|$ is an entanglement monotone because it is derived from $|\mathcal{F}_2|$, $|\mathcal{F}_4|$ and $|\mathcal{F}_5|$ which are themselves entanglement monotones. It yields zero for all product states, and reaches 1 for a class of maximally entangled states (see below). Together with the fact that it is premutation-invariant, these suggest that $|\mathcal{F}_2'|$ is potentially a good candidate for genuine 4-qubit entanglement measure. To see its advantage in characterizing genuine multipartite entanglement, we calculate its value in comparison with $|\mathcal{F}_2|$ for three maximally entangled 4-qubit states

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1111\rangle + |0000\rangle), \\ |\Phi_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\sqrt{2}\,|1111\rangle + |1000\rangle + |0100\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0001\rangle), \\ |\Phi_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|1111\rangle + |1100\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0001\rangle), \end{aligned}$$

and states derived from them by qubit permutations. $|\Phi_1\rangle, |\Phi_2\rangle$ and $|\Phi_3\rangle$ are known to be genuine 4-qubit entangled and belong to different entanglement classes. As shown in the upper left (3 by 3) corner of Table II, for $|\Phi_1\rangle, |\Phi_2\rangle$ and $|\Phi_3\rangle$, different subsets of

$\{|\mathcal{F}_1|, |\mathcal{F}_2|, |\mathcal{F}_3|\}$ have zero values. Since a state with zero value for one monotone can not be transformed into another state with nonzero value for the same monotone under SLOCC operations, $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s are therefore a powerful tool in distinguishing these three entanglement classes.

Now we consider the transformations of $|\Phi_1\rangle, |\Phi_2\rangle, |\Phi_3\rangle$ under qubit permutations. It is easy to see that states $|\Phi_1\rangle, |\Phi_2\rangle$ are both permutation-invariant. However, we can obtain two other 4-qubit maximally entangled states from $|\Phi_3\rangle$ by qubit permutation:

$$\begin{aligned}|\Phi_4\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|1111\rangle + |1001\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0100\rangle),\\ |\Phi_5\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|1111\rangle + |0101\rangle + |1000\rangle + |0010\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

$|\Phi_4\rangle, |\Phi_5\rangle$ should have the same genuine 4-qubit entanglement with $|\Phi_3\rangle$ since they are obtained from $|\Phi_3\rangle$ by qubit permutaitons. With local unitary operations, it can be easily shown that they all belong to one of the two types of 4-qubit graph states in [18]. However, as shown in Table II $|\mathcal{F}_2|$ has different values for $|\Phi_3\rangle, |\Phi_4\rangle$ and these two states would be characterized as belonging to different entanglement classes should $\{|\mathcal{F}_1|, |\mathcal{F}_2|, |\mathcal{F}_3|\}$ be used to study the entanglement structures of 4-qubit pure states. In contrast, $\{|\mathcal{F}_1|, |\mathcal{F}_2'|, |\mathcal{F}_3|\}$ yield the same values for $|\Phi_3\rangle, |\Phi_4\rangle$ and $|\Phi_5\rangle$ and thus correctly put them in the same entanglement class. This is a direct manifestation of the permutation-invariance of $|\mathcal{F}_2'|$.

	$\lvert\mathcal{F}_1\rvert$	$\lvert\mathcal{F}_2\rvert$	$\lvert\mathcal{F}_3\rvert$	$\lvert\mathcal{F}_4\rvert$	$\lvert\mathcal{F}_5\rvert$	$\lvert\mathcal{F}_2'\rvert$
$\lvert\Phi_1\rangle$	1	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	1	3
$\lvert\Phi_2\rangle$	$\frac{8}{9}$	0	0	0	0	0
$\lvert\Phi_3\rangle$	0	0	1	0	1	1
$\lvert\Phi_4\rangle$	0	1	1	0	0	1
$\lvert\Phi_5\rangle$	0	0	1	1	0	1

TABLE II: Entanglement monotones for the maximally entangled 4-qubit states.

To further see the value of $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right|$, we calculate the genuine multipartite entanglement for 4-qubit cluster-class states as an interesting application of our results. This problem has been considered in [19, 20], where the authors used the principle of quantum complementarity relations (QCR) to derive genuine 4-qubit entanglement by subtracting fewer-partite entanglement from a qubit's bipartite entanglement with the rest of the 4-qubit system.

Though QCR reveals some very intriguing physics, its procedure is rather complicated and it is not easy to even prove that the result given by QCR is a monotone [20]. It also relies on the availability of properly defined fewer-partite entanglement measures [19].

We re-examine the genuine 4-qubit entanglement in cluster-class states using $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right|$. In Ref.[20], the authors considered three types of 4-qubit cluster-class states. These states can be obtained by local operations starting from the maximally entangled states $|\Phi_1\rangle$ and $|\Phi_3\rangle$ $(|\Phi_4\rangle, |\Phi_5\rangle)$. For example, the first type of states,

$$|\Pi_1\rangle = a\,|0000\rangle + b\,|0011\rangle + c\,|1100\rangle - d\,|1111\rangle\,,$$

correspond to our $|\Phi_3\rangle$ class. This is because of the following transformations under local unitary operations:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_3\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}(|1111\rangle + |1100\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0001\rangle)_{1234} \\ &\xrightarrow{\sigma_4^x} \frac{1}{2}(|1110\rangle + |1101\rangle + |0011\rangle + |0000\rangle)_{1234} \\ &\xrightarrow{H_3 \otimes H_4} \frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle + |0011\rangle + |1100\rangle - |1111\rangle)_{1234}, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where H is the Hadamard transformation. Now we calculate the values of $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right|$ for $|\Pi_1\rangle$. First, since $|\mathcal{F}_i|$'s are all entanglement monotones, we have $|\mathcal{F}_2| = |\mathcal{F}_4| = 0$ according to Table II. This can also be deduced by the fact that $ad = bc$ since $|\Pi_1\rangle$ and $|\Phi_3\rangle$ can be converted into each other with finite probabilities through invertible local operations. Therefore, $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right| = |\mathcal{F}_5| = 16|ad + bc|^4$. Since $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right|$ is of degree 8 and the result from QCR is of degree 4, we take the square root of $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right|$ and we find that the result is identical to the 4-qubit entanglement calculated from QCR which is $4|ad + bc|^2$.

The second type of states that the authors considered in [20],

$$|\Pi_2\rangle = a\,|0000\rangle - b\,|0111\rangle - c\,|1010\rangle + d\,|1101\rangle$$

correspond to the $|\Phi_5\rangle$ class in Table II since they can be obtained from $|\Phi_5\rangle$ by local opearions similar to Eq.(25). Interestingly, if we calculate the 4-qubit entanglement of $|\Pi_2\rangle$ by QCR we will need to calculate 3-qubit entanglement first, therefore the calculation is nontrivial. When we calculate $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right|$, we find $|\mathcal{F}_2| = |\mathcal{F}_5| = 0$ and $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right| = |\mathcal{F}_4| = 256|abcd|^2$. This is exactly the square of the result obtained from QCR.

Therefore, the 4-qubit genuine entanglement of cluster-class states in [20] calculated according to QCR coincides with the value obtained with $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right|$. Considering that these two approaches have no obvious intrinsic connections, this is intriguing and it hints that $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right|$ may indeed be a good genuine 4-qubit entanglement measure. We can also conveniently draw some conclusions not so easy to prove in QCR. E.g., the result given by QCR is a monotone and permutation-invariant. The advantage of $\left|\mathcal{F}_2'\right|$ though, is it can be calculated directly once a state is given without reference to fewer-partite entanglement. Therefore it may find broader applications, especially when the application of QCR is difficult due to the difficulty in determining what fewer-partite entanglement expressions should be used [19].

In conclusion, we studied the permutational properties of multipartite entanglement monotones by specifically examining the three 4-qubit entanglement monotones $\{|\mathcal{F}_1|, |\mathcal{F}_2|, |\mathcal{F}_3|\}$ introduced by Osterloh and Siewert[12, 13]. We find one of these, $|\mathcal{F}_2|$, does not satisfy the natural requirement of permutational invariance for a genuine multipartite entanglement measure and propose an alternative that is permutation-invariant. By comparison with results from QCR we find that our new monotone properly measures the genuine 4-qubit entanglement in 4-qubit cluster-class states. Our results are intriguing in understanding multipartite entanglement.

Note added: After we finished the preparation of our manuscript, we noticed that the relations in Eq.(19,20,21) were also obtained by D. Ž. oković and A. Osterloh in a recent work [21].

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by National Fundamental Research Program 2006CB921900, NCET-04-0587, the Innovation funds from Chinese Academy of Sciences, and National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 60621064, 10574126).

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).

[2] C. H. Bennett, H. J. Bernstein, S. Popescu and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2046 (1996).

[3] C. H. Bennett, S. Popescu, D. Rohrlich, J. A. Smolin and A. V. Thapliyal, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 012307 (2000).

[4] W. Dür, G. Vidal and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 062314 (2000).

[5] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, B. DeMoor and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052112 (2002).

[6] A. Miyake, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 012108 (2003).

[7] G. Jaeger, A. V. Sergienko, B. E. A. Saleh and M. C. Teich, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022318 (2003).

[8] L. Lamata, J. León, D. Salgado and E. Solano, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052336 (2006).

[9] A. Wong and N. Christensen, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 044301 (2001).

[10] D. A. Meyer and N. R. Wallach, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 4273 (2002).

[11] H. Heydari and G. Björk, J. Phys. A **37**, 9251 (2004).

[12] A. Osterloh and J. Siewert, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 012337 (2005).

[13] A. Osterloh and J. Siewert, Int. J. Quant. Inf. **4**, 531 (2006), arxiv.org: quant-ph/0506073 (2005).

[14] J. M. Cai, Z. W. Zhou and G. C. Guo, Quant. Inf. and Comp. **7**, 766 (2007).

[15] G. Vidal, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 355 (2000).

[16] J-G. Luque and J-Y. Thibon, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 042303 (2003).

[17] M. S. Leifer, N. Linden and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 052304 (2004).

[18] M. Hein, J. Eisert and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 062311 (2004).

[19] Y.-K. Bai, D. Yang, and Z. D. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 022336 (2007).

[20] Y. K. Bai and Z. D. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 032313 (2008).

[21] D. Ž. Doković and A. Osterloh, arxiv.org: quant-ph/0804.1661 (2008).